



# PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF RURAL ALTRUISTIC ADOLESCENT STUDENTS AT SECONDARY LEVEL

\* Mukul Baran Mandal<sup>1</sup> | Dr. Chitralkha Mehera<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Research Scholar, Department of Education, The University of Burdwan, Burdwan, West Bengal, India.

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Education, The University of Burdwan, Burdwan, West Bengal, India.

## ABSTRACT

The present study investigated the nature of Big Five Personality Traits (BFPT) of rural altruistic adolescent students. Sample comprised of 400 rural adolescent students of secondary level. Altruism Scale (AS) and Big Five Personality Inventory (BFPI), both adopted by the investigators, were used to assess Altruism and Big Five Personality Traits respectively. Descriptive survey method was used for the investigation. The result revealed significant gender difference in altruism as well as in two of Big Five Personality Traits. Rural altruistic adolescent boy students scored higher on Extraversion than rural altruistic adolescent girl students whereas the later scored higher on Agreeableness than the former. One notable point is that there was no significant gender difference in Openness, Conscientiousness, and Neuroticism.

High Altruistic adolescent students possessed more Extraversion and Agreeableness than both Medium and Low Altruistic adolescent students. Again there were significant differences between the students of Medium Altruistic group and Low Altruistic group in respect of Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Agreeableness favoring the former group.

The study further indicated that three personality traits namely, Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Agreeableness were essential for construction of altruistic personality of rural adolescent students as regression equations confirmed the ability of altruism of rural adolescent students to predict those traits.

**KEY WORDS:** Altruism, Adolescent Children, Secondary Level, Big Five Personality Traits.

## Introduction

Altruism based on pure desire to help others (Smith and Mackie, 2000)[10] is generally defined as the voluntary act to favor another without any return (Aranson et. al, 2004)[1]. Eisenberg et al. (1999) defined altruism as "behavior motivated by concern for others or by internalized values, goals, and self-rewards rather than by the expectation of concrete or social rewards, or the desire to avoid punishment or sanctions."

On the other hand Personality is defined as "the dynamic organization within the individual of those psycho-physical systems which determine his unique adjustment to his environment". Allport

Adolescence is a period in which rapid physical and emotional changes undergoes along with social development. It is the period of manifesting one's personality traits which determine his/her different behaviors. Altruistic behaviors are observed often in adolescence, which are obviously motivated by some personality traits. Hence, it is assumed that there would have some relationship between altruism and personality traits. Again, the pattern and strength of altruistic behavior vary within the individual. Anna Drebera et al (2011)[4] and Mandal M.B and C. Mehera (2016)[7] reported girls to be more altruistic than boys. Girls' behavioral traits are more significant compared to boys (Rashmi et al) [9].

In rural area the adolescent students' altruistic behaviors are influenced by rural culture, interaction with others, gregariousness, ethnicity etc thereby influencing their own personality traits. Therefore, it is necessary to come across with the nature of personality traits of rural altruistic students so as to compare with those of non-altruistic students and take initiatives to upgrade the personality structures as well as altruism of non-altruistic students through value oriented teaching and motivations.

## Literature Review

H. W. Bierhoff and E. Rohmann (2004) [3] investigated the influence of the altruistic personality in general and social responsibility in particular on pro-social behavior in the context of the empathy-altruism hypothesis. Their results indicated that in the 'easy-escape condition' an altruistic motivation was revealed but in the 'difficult-escape condition' an egoistic motivation was more dominant. They also showed that specific profiles of personality variables were related with helpfulness in the easy-escape as well as in difficult-escape conditions.

Emmerik, Jawahar and Stone (2004) [5] made a field study to examine the relationship between the Big Five personality factors and helping behaviors that occurs in the context of home, work place (organization) and larger society. Authors' study showed that Conscientiousness relates positively to helping behavior that directly benefit the self (household activities) or may benefit the self (Organizational Citizenship Behavior) but is negatively related to helping behaviors (Volunteerism) that are unlikely to benefit the self. Similarly, Introver-

sion was positively and weakly related to household activities but negatively related to organizational citizenship behavior. There was a positive relationship between Openness to experiences and Volunteerism.

Another study was conducted by Dorothy and Martha in July 2009 [12] who reported that people with high altruism were high on Extraversion and Agreeableness-the two factors of Big Five Personality traits and that concluded that Extraversion and Agreeableness are essential traits for making up altruistic personality.

Again in 2009 James B Stiff et al [6] conducted two studies to examine the relationships among different dimensions of empathy, communication and pro-social behavior. The results suggested that, pro-social behavior was motivated by altruism. Emotional reactions to the perceived distress of others were preceded by a concern for others. Their findings strongly supported an altruistic interpretation of pro-social behavior and suggested that the egoistic model could be reformulated.

Anna Drebera et al (2011) [4] showed that boys were less altruistic and more risk taking than girls and there was no gender gap in change of performance when performance under non-competition was compared with that under competition.

Another experiment was done by Michael and Roelofs (March 2011) [8] to identify heterogeneity preferences according to personality, gender, status, giving and taking for altruism. The authors found that the effect of gender on giving was more stable than previously understood and was explained collectively by various personality factors. They also found that women, high status treatment individuals, and individuals in giving language treatment gave less and were also less sensitive to the price giving

## Objectives

1. To assess altruism of rural adolescents students with the help of the Altruism Scale (AS) adopted by the investigator.
2. To assess personality traits of rural adolescent students with help of Big Five Personality Inventory (BFPI) adopted by the investigator.
3. To find out sex-wise difference if any in Altruism of rural adolescent students.
4. To find out sex-wise and Strata-wise differences, if any, in each of Big Five Personality Traits of rural adolescent students.
5. To determine the relationship of Altruism with each of Big Five Personality traits of rural adolescent students.

6. To develop regression equation in order to obtain an estimation of personality traits in terms of Altruism of rural adolescent students

### Null Hypotheses

<sup>0</sup>H<sub>1</sub>: No significant difference exists between rural altruistic adolescent boy- and girl-students in respect of their Altruism

<sup>0</sup>H<sub>2</sub>: No significant difference exists between rural altruistic adolescent boy- and girl-students in respect of their

- i) Openness to Experience (O)
- ii) Conscientiousness ©
- iii) Extraversion (E)
- iv) Agreeableness (A)
- v) Neuroticism (N)

<sup>0</sup>H<sub>3</sub>: There is no significant difference between High-and Low-Altruistic rural adolescent students in respect of their

- i) Openness to Experience (O)
- ii) Conscientiousness ©
- iii) Extraversion (E)
- iv) Agreeableness (A)
- v) Neuroticism (N)

<sup>0</sup>H<sub>4</sub>: No significant difference exists between High -and Medium-Altruistic rural adolescent students in respect of their

- i) Openness to Experience (O)
- ii) Conscientiousness ©
- iii) Extraversion (E)
- iv) Agreeableness (A)
- v) Neuroticism (N)

<sup>0</sup>H<sub>5</sub>: No significant difference exists between Medium-and Low-Altruistic rural adolescent students in respect of their

- i) Openness to Experience (O)
- ii) Conscientiousness ©
- iii) Extraversion (E)
- iv) Agreeableness (A)
- v) Neuroticism (N)

<sup>0</sup>H<sub>6</sub>: There is no significant impact of Altruism of rural adolescent students on

- i) Openness to Experience (O)
- ii) Conscientiousness ©
- iii) Extraversion (E)
- iv) Agreeableness (A)
- v) Neuroticism (N)

<sup>0</sup>H<sub>7</sub>: Personality Traits namely,

- i) Openness to experiences (O)
- ii) Conscientiousness ©
- iii) Extraversion (E)
- iv) Agreeableness (A)
- v) Neuroticism (N)

of rural adolescent students cannot be predicted from their Altruism Scores

### Variables

Following variables were used in this investigation.

- a) Altruism of rural adolescent students
- b) Personality Traits of rural adolescent students
- c) Gender (Rural Boy Students and Rural Girl Students)
- d) Strata (High Altruistic, Medium Altruistic and Low Altruistic)

### Methodology

#### Research Method

Descriptive method incorporated with survey technique was followed for this investigation.

#### Sample

400 adolescent students (age 15+ years), comprising of equal number of boy and girl students from four (two for boys and two for girls) rural schools were constituted the sample. Multistage sampling was considered for the purpose.

#### Tools Used

Altruism Scale (AS) ( $r=.83$ ,  $p\leq .01$ ) and Big Five Personality Inventory (BFPI) ( $r=.78$ ,  $p\leq .01$ ) both adopted and standardized by the investigator were used to measure the Altruism and Big Five Personality Traits of the adolescent students respectively. Altruism scale was adopted from Roy and Ghosh who adopted with some modification of the original scale of Eisenberg *et al.* Altruism Scale has five indicators each of which is represented by two situations each having five alternative responses with a scale value of 1 to 5.

Big Five Personality Inventory was adopted from Paul Costa, Jr. and Robert McCrae's Neo FFI. The adopted scale has five domains each having six facets. Each of six facets of each domain is represented by two statements with five alternatives considering the different traits belonging to that sub domain. Thus, the total number of items in the scale was 60 including 12 items of each domain.

#### Procedure

Multistage sampling was followed to construct sample. At first four rural schools- two for boys and two for girls from Birbhum district were randomly selected. Then, from each school 100 adolescent students of age 15+ were randomly selected and Altruism scale was administered on them (total 400) to obtain their Altruism Scores. Next, the students were shorted as High Altruistic who scored greater than Median + Q; Medium Altruistic who scored between Median - Q to Median + Q; and Low Altruistic who scored less than Median - Q. Then, BFPI was administered on those 400 adolescent students to obtain their scores in each of Big Five Personality Traits (BFPT).

The study was based on both descriptive and inferential statistics. F- tests were adopted to test the null hypotheses <sup>0</sup>H<sub>1</sub> and <sup>0</sup>H<sub>2</sub>, F-tests were adopted and then t-tests were followed where F-values were significant at .05 or lesser level.

In order to test the null hypothesis <sup>0</sup>H<sub>6</sub>, Correlation Coefficients between Altruism and each of BFPT were calculated.

Regression equations were constructed and applied to test the null hypothesis <sup>0</sup>H<sub>7</sub> on thirty randomly selected samples.

#### Analysis of Data

The Mean (M), Standard Deviation (SD), Skewness (Sk), Kurtosis (Ku) and Standard Error of Mean (SE<sub>M</sub>) of the scores in AS as well as in BFPI were found out with regard to three categories of the testees namely Boy students, Girl students and the Entire sample. The various statistical measures for AS and BFPI are given in Tables -1 and 2 respectively.

**Table-1 Statements of Statistics for Gender-wise, Strata-wise and Overall Distributions of Scores in Altruism**

	N	M	SD	Sk	Ku	SEM
Entire Sample	400	25.62	6.38	.261	-.741	.319
Boy Students	200	23.17	5.56	.334	-.473	.393
Girl Students	200	28.07	6.22	.090	-1.007	.440
High Altruistic	71	35.51	2.16	.822	.459	.257
Medium Altruistic	210	26.35	3.19	.221	-1.241	.220
Low Altruistic	119	18.44	2.26	-.770	-.161	.207

Table-1 indicates that all the six distributions of scores of Altruism were positively skewed except for the distribution of low altruistic students. Further it was observed from the kurtosis values that most of the distributions were platykurtic except for high altruistic.

**Table:-2 Statements of Statistics for Gender-wise and Overall Distributions of Scores in BFPI**

	Entire Sample					Boy Students					Girl Students				
	O	C	E	A	N	O	C	E	A	N	O	C	E	A	N
N	400	400	400	400	400	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
M	30.84	30.92	33.18	32.62	23.20	30.52	30.72	34.11	31.58	23.24	31.16	31.13	32.25	33.65	23.16
SD	4.71	4.29	6.53	5.83	3.64	4.66	4.17	6.076	5.56	4.17	4.74	4.42	6.84	5.91	3.02
Sk	.240	.063	.415	.368	.044	.262	-.193	.643	.766	-.002	.218	.263	.364	.010	.120
Ku	-.073	-.433	-.058	-.631	-.093	-.056	-.552	.233	.370	-.410	-.056	-.422	-.334	-1.042	-.096
SEM	.235	.215	.326	.291	.182	.330	.295	.430	.393	.295	.335	.313	.784	.418	.213

Note: O=Openness, C=Conscientiousness, E=Extraversion, A=Agreeableness, N=Neuroticism

Table-2 indicates positive skewness in the overall and sex wise distribution of scores in each of BFPT except Conscientiousness (C) and Neuroticism (N) for Boy

Students. Kurtosis values show that the distributions were platykurtic except for Extraversion (E) and Agreeableness (A) of boy students.

**Table-3: Statements of Statistics for Strata-wise Distributions of Scores in BFPI**

	High Altruistic					Medium Altruistic					Low Altruistic				
	O	C	E	A	N	O	C	E	A	N	O	C	E	A	N
N	71	71	71	71	71	210	210	210	210	210	119	119	119	119	119
M	30.92	31.49	39.31	39.93	23.18	31.00	31.47	33.09	33.08	23.26	30.52	29.62	29.69	27.45	23.11
SD	5.09	4.45	6.15	3.12	2.97	4.71	4.35	5.97	4.77	3.69	4.48	4.06	4.86	3.04	3.92
Sk	.041	.450	.060	.429	.120	.333	-.042	.391	.515	.083	.197	-.097	.259	.148	-.030
Ku	-.595	-.408	-.728	-.334	-.008	.280	-.637	.134	-.046	-.231	-.366	-.354	-.092	-.263	-.075
SEM	.604	.528	.730	.371	.352	.325	.292	.412	.329	.255	.410	.372	.446	.278	.360

Note: O=Openness, C=Conscientiousness, E=Extraversion, A=Agreeableness, N=Neuroticism

Table-3 indicates positive skewness for Strata-wise distribution of scores in each of the BFPT except Conscientiousness (C) for Medium Altruistic students and Conscientiousness (C) and Neuroticism (N) for Low altruistic students. Kurtosis values show that the distributions were platykurtic except Openness (O) and Extraversion (E) for Medium Altruistic adolescent students.

Gender wise division of High, Medium and Low- Altruistic adolescent students are given in table-4

**Table-4: Showing Gender-wise Division of High, Medium and Low- Altruistic Adolescent Students**

	High Altruistic	Medium Altruistic	Low Altruistic	Total
Boy Students	12 (6%)	105 (52.5%)	83 (41.5%)	200
Girl students	59 (29.5%)	105 (52.5%)	36 (18%)	200
Total	71 (17.75%)	210 (52.5%)	119 (29.75%)	400

Note: Figures in parenthesis indicates corresponding percentage

**Table-5a: df, Sums of Squares (SS), Mean Squares (MS) and F-Values for Scores in BFPI (Openness)**

Source of Variance	df	SS	MS	F
Due to Gender	1	28.579	28.579	.441+
Due to Strata	2	19.634	9.817	.318+
Error	394	87.72.199	22.264	

+Insignificant

Since, F-values are not significant in respect of Gender and Strata; t-test is not warranted. So, it can be stated that there is no gender-wise as well as strata-wise differences in Openness of rural adolescent students. Therefore, hypotheses  $H_0$ ,  $H_1(i)$ ,  $H_2(i)$  and  $H_3(i)$  are retained.

**Table-5b: df, Sums of Squares (SS), Mean Squares (MS) and F-Values for Scores in BFPI (Conscientiousness)**

Source of Variance	df	SS	MS	F
Due to Gender	1	.329	.329	.018+
Due to Strata	2	258.428	129.214	7.204*
Error	394	7067.035	17.937	

\*Significant at .01 level, +Insignificant

Since, F-value is not significant in respect of Gender, t-test is not warranted. So, it can be stated that there is no gender-wise difference in Conscientiousness. Therefore, Hypothesis  $H_0$ , (ii) is retained. As the F-value is significant in respect of Strata, t-tests are warranted to test the strata-wise differences in Conscientiousness. Table-5c: df, Sums of Squares (SS), Mean Squares (MS) and F-Values for Scores in BFPI (Extraversion)

**Table-5c: df, Sums of Squares (SS), Mean Squares (MS) and F-Values for Scores in BFPI (Extraversion)**

Source of Variance	df	SS	MS	F
Due to Gender	1	1500.404	1500.404	54.202*
Due to Strata	2	4606.518	2303.259	83.205*
Error	394	10906.627	27.682	

\*Significant at .01 level

Table-5c shows significant F-values in respect of both Gender and Strata. There-

fore, t-tests are warranted to test the gender-wise as well as strata-wise differences in Extraversion.

**Table-5d: df, Sums of Squares (SS), Mean Squares (MS) and F-Values for Scores in BFPI (Agreeableness)**

Source of Variance	df	SS	MS	F
Due to Gender	1	115.206	115.206	7.094*
Due to Strata	2	5601.259	2800.630	172.442*
Error	394	6398.940	16.241	

\*Significant at .01 level

As F-values in the above table are significant in respect of both gender and strata, t-tests are warranted to test the gender-wise as well as strata-wise differences in Agreeableness.

**Table-5e: df, Sums of Squares (SS), Mean Squares (MS) and F-Values for Scores in BFPI (Neuroticism)**

Source of Variance	df	SS	MS	F
Due to Gender	1	2.169	2.169	.423+
Due to Strata	2	25.720	12.860	.965+
Error	394	5251.879	13.330	

+Insignificant at .01 level

Table-5e depicts insignificant F-values in respect of both Gender and Strata. Hence, t-tests are not warranted and it can be said that there is no gender-wise as well as strata-wise difference in Neuroticism.

**Significance of Sex wise Difference between the Mean Score of the Adolescent Students in AS and in BFPI (with respect to five traits)**

The data are expressed in tables - 6 and 7 respectively.

**Table-6: Showing the Values of N, Mean, SD, SED and t- for Sex wise As Well As Strata wise Differences in Altruism**

Group	N	Mean	S.D	S.ED	t-statistic
Boys	200	28.07	6.22	.590	8.296*
Girls	200	23.18	5.56		

\*Significant at .01 level

Table-6 depicts that t-value 8.296 is statistically significant at .01 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis  $H_0$  is rejected indicating that there exists significant difference between the rural adolescent boy- and girl- students in respect of their Altruism.

**Table-7: Showing the Values of N, Mean, SD, SED and t for Sex-wise Differences in Extraversion and Agreeableness**

Measures	Extraversion		Agreeableness	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
N	200	200	200	200
Mean	34.12	32.24	31.58	33.65
SD	6.08	6.84		
SEd	-1.870		2.470	
t- value	2.890*		3.596*	

\*Significant at .01 level

The above table depicts that both the t-values 2.890 and 3.596 are significant at .01 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis  $H_2$  (iii) that is, no significant difference exists between rural altruistic adolescent boys and rural altruistic adolescent girls in respect of their Extraversion and null hypothesis  $H_2$  (iv) that is, no significant difference exists between rural altruistic adolescent boys and rural altruistic adolescent girls in respect of their Agreeableness are rejected. Table-8: Showing the Values of N, Mean, SD, SED and t for Difference between High-and Low-Altruistic Adolescent Students in Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Agreeableness

**Table-8: Showing the Values of N, Mean, SD, SE<sub>D</sub> and t for Difference between High-and Low-Altruistic Adolescent Students in Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Agreeableness**

Measures	Conscientiousness		Extraversion		Agreeableness	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
N	71	119	71	119	71	119
Mean	31.49	29.62	39.31	29.69	39.93	27.45
SD	4.45	4.05	6.15	4.86	3.12	3.14
SE <sub>D</sub>		1.871		.807		.460
t-value		2.967**		11.928*		27.131*

\*Significant at .01 level, \*\*Significant at .05 level

The above table depicts t-values 2.967, 11.928 and 27.131 to be significant at either .05 or lesser level. Therefore, the null hypothesis  $H_3$  (ii) that is, no significant difference exists between High- and Low-Altruistic adolescent students in respect of their Conscientiousness, null hypothesis  $H_3$  (iii) that is, no significant difference exists between High-and Low-Altruistic adolescent students in respect of their Extraversion; and null hypothesis  $H_3$  (iv) that is, no significant difference exists between High- and Low- Altruistic adolescent students in respect of their Agreeableness are rejected.

**Table-9: Showing the Values of N, Mean, SD, SED and t for Difference between High-and Medium-Altruistic Adolescent Students in Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Agreeableness**

Measures	Conscientiousness		Extraversion		Agreeableness	
	High	Medium	High	Medium	High	Medium
N	71	210	71	210	71	210
Mean	31.49	31.47	39.31	33.09	39.93	33.08
SD	4.45	4.23	6.15	5.97	3.12	4.77
SE <sub>D</sub>		.589		.826		.606
t-value		.037+		7.535*		11.308*

\*Significant at .01 level, +Insignificant

The above table depicts t-values 7.535 and 11.308 to be significant at .01 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis  $H_4$  (iii) that is, no significant difference exists between High- and Medium- Altruistic adolescent students in respect of their Extraversion; and null hypothesis  $H_4$  (iv) that is, no significant difference exists between High- and Medium- Altruistic adolescent students in respect of their Agreeableness are rejected. Again, the insignificant t-value .037 infers that no significant difference exists between High- and Medium-Altruistic adolescent students in respect of their Conscientiousness that is hypothesis  $H_4$  (ii) is retained.

**Table-10: Showing the Values of N, Mean, SD, SED and t for Difference between Medium- and Low-Altruistic Adolescent Students in Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Agreeableness**

Measures	Conscientiousness		Extraversion		Agreeableness	
	Medium	Low	Medium	Low	Medium	Low
N	210	119	210	119	210	119
Mean	31.47	29.62	33.09	29.69	33.08	27.45
S.D	4.23	4.05	5.97	4.86	4.77	3.04
S.E <sub>D</sub>		.479		.642		.658
t-value		3.865*		5.228*		11.610*

\*Significant at .01 level

The above table depicts t-values 3.865, 5.228 and 11.610 to be significant at .01 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis  $H_5$  (ii) that is, no significant difference exists between Medium- and Low- Altruistic adolescent students in respect of their Conscientiousness; null hypothesis  $H_5$  (iii) that is, no significant difference exists between Medium- and Low- Altruistic adolescent students in respect of their Extraversion; and null hypothesis  $H_5$  (iv) that is, no significant difference exists between Medium- and Low- Altruistic adolescent students in respect of their Agreeableness are rejected.

**Table-11: Value of Coefficient of Correlation (r) between Altruism and Each of the BFPT**

	N	r	P
Altruism and Openness	400	.034	.502
Altruism and Conscientiousness	400	.187*	.000
Altruism and Extraversion	400	.572*	.000

Altruism and Agreeableness	400	.819*	.000
Altruism and Neuroticism	400	-.004	.929

\*Significant

Table-11 shows r-values .187, .572 and .819 to be significant at .01 level. Thus, the null hypotheses  $H_6$  (ii),  $H_6$  (iii) and  $H_6$  (iv) are rejected thereby implying the positive relationship between altruism and each of Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Agreeableness. Further, from the insignificant r-values in the above table it is evident that there is no relationship between Altruism and Openness and between Altruism and Neuroticism. Therefore, null hypotheses  $H_6$  (i) and  $H_6$  (v) are retained. Regression Equations for Prediction of Personality Traits (Big Five) Using Altruism Scores of the Students

The values of R along with other relevant measures are given in Table -12.

**Table-12: Showing the Values of R along with Some Relevant Measures**

Openness		Conscientiousness		Extraversion		Agreeableness		Neuroticism	
R	.034	R	.187	R	.572	R	.819	R	.004
R <sup>2</sup>	.001	R <sup>2</sup>	.035	R <sup>2</sup>	.327	R <sup>2</sup>	.670	R <sup>2</sup>	.000
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.001	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.033	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.325	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.670	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.002
SE	4.710	SE	4.225	SE	5.364	SE	3.349	SE	3.642
F	.451+	F	14.440*	F	193.294*	F	809.743 *	F	.008+
p-value	.502	p-value	.000	p-value	.000	p-value	.000	p-value	.929

\*Significant at .01 level, + Insignificant

Table-12 shows that F- values .451 and .008 are insignificant. Therefore, the null hypothesis:  $H_7$  (i), and  $H_7$  (v) that is, the personality traits Openness and Neuroticism cannot be predicted from the altruistic behaviors of rural adolescent students are retained.

**Table-13: Showing Regression Coefficients along with Other Relevant Measures for Conscientiousness**

	Coefficient	S.E	t-statistic	Sig
Constant	27.698	.875	31.654	.000
Altruism	.126	.033	3.800	.000

**Table-14: Showing Regression Coefficients along with Other Relevant Measures for Extraversion**

	Coefficient	S.E	t-statistic	Sig
Constant	18.191	1.111	16.374	.000
Altruism	.585	.042	13.903	.000

**Table-15: Showing Regression Coefficients along with other Relevant Measures for Agreeableness**

	Coefficient	S.E	t-statistic	Sig
Constant	13.462	.694	19.406	.000
Altruism	.748	.026	28.456	.000

The regression equation of Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Agreeableness on Altruism are  $Y_c = 27.698 + .126 X$ ,  $Y_e = 18.191 + .585X$  and  $Y_a = 13.462 + .748X$  respectively.

Where  $Y_c$  stands for Conscientiousness,  $Y_e$  stands for Extraversion,  $Y_a$  stands for Agreeableness, and  $X$  stands for Altruism

These formulae were applied for prediction in thirty randomly selected samples. The mean values of obtained and predicted scores (for Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Agreeableness) along with other relevant measures are given in Table -16. (Predicted value is estimate value and not the correct value).

**Table-16: Presentation of t-Values of the Concerned Mean Scores of Altruism of the Adolescent Students**

Measures	Conscientiousness		Extraversion		Agreeableness	
	Obtained	Predicted	Obtained	Predicted	Obtained	Predicted
M	30.80	31.23	34.23	34.80	33.87	34.47
SD	2.68	1.10	5.34	4.86	5.91	6.12
S.E <sub>M</sub>		.530		1.318		1.553
t		.818+		.430+		.386+

+ Insignificant

The t-values .818, .430 and .386 shown in Table-16 are insignificant. This means that the difference between the concerned two means (obtained and predicted scores) for each of the Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Agreeableness is very slight and statistically insignificant. So Altruism can be used as a predictor of Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Agreeableness separately. Therefore, null hypotheses:  $H_7$  (ii),  $H_7$  (iii) and  $H_7$  (iv) that is Personality traits--



Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Agreeableness cannot be predicted from the Altruism of rural altruistic adolescent students are rejected.

### Discussion

Table-4 implies that the percentage of High Altruistic students (17.75%) in rural area is lesser than that of Medium Altruistic students (52.5%) as well as Low Altruistic (29.75%) in the same area. That is rural society is Medium Altruism pervading society. Again, the percentage of Medium Altruistic adolescent boy students is equal to the percentage of medium Altruistic adolescent girl students. But, High Altruistic adolescent girl students appear in greater percentage than High Altruistic adolescent boy students.

Table -6 shows that adolescent girl students in rural area are more altruistic than adolescent boy students in that area. This supports the findings of Anna Drebera et al (2012) [4] and Mandal M.B and C. Mehera (2016) [7]. Now, girls are advanced in empathy level than boys (Toussaint and Webb, 2005) [11] and human capacity of altruism is confined to those persons who are empathized by us (Batson and Oleson, 1991). [2] Therefore, girl students are more altruistic than boy students. This means compared to adolescent boy students, the adolescent girl students have more selfless concern for other people, that is, they have more intension to provide benefits to them in exchange of nothing.

Table-7 shows that rural adolescent girl students possess more agreeableness in their personality structure than rural adolescent boy students, which implies that those girls are more concerned with other's well being and have more kindness, co-operation, warmth and consideration in comparison of those boy students. The table also indicates that the rural altruistic adolescent boy students are more extrovert than rural altruistic adolescent girl students. From this it is evident that rural adolescent boy students are friendlier, talkative and jolly compared to rural adolescent girl students.

Table-8 and 9 infer that rural High Altruistic adolescent students are more extravert than rural Medium and Low Altruistic adolescent students, which implies that rural High Altruistic adolescent students are more friendly and jolly, like to enjoy more human interactions, like to be more talkative, assertive and gregarious than rural Medium as well as Low Altruistic adolescent students.

Conscientiousness is another Big Personality trait which also differs significantly with respect to High Altruism and Low Altruism. This implies that rural adolescent students having more Altruism are more dutiful, orderly, strove to achievement and selfcontrolled.

Further, the tables infer that rural High Altruistic adolescent students possess more Agreeableness in their personality structure. Agreeableness concerns with other well being, kindness, empathy (M.C. Ashton, 1998), co-operation, warmth, etc. A High Altruistic person is also more concerned for others, more empathetic and more co-operative in comparison to Medium and Low Altruistic person. Therefore, it is natural for High Altruistic adolescent students to have more Agreeableness than Medium or Low Altruistic students.

From Table-10 it can also be stated that students having more altruism are more Conscientious, Extravert and Agreeable.

Table-11 indicates that altruism has an impact on three Big Personality Traits namely, Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Agreeableness.

From the above discussion it is evident that Conscientious, Extraversion and Agreeableness play a significant role in constructing altruistic personality (Dorothy and Martha, July 2009) [12].

The regression coefficients as in Tables-13, 14 and 15 show that Altruism of rural adolescent students can be used as the predictor of their Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Agreeableness-the three of BFPT. It means that we are able to obtain the scores of Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Agreeableness of rural adolescent students from assessing only their scores of Altruism.

Table-16 provides the high degree of acceptance of the constructed three linear regression equations.

### Summary and Conclusion

Our study examined the nature of Big Five Personality Traits of rural altruistic adolescent students. A sample of 400 adolescent students was taken from rural area for the study. The main points revealed by the study are as follows.

- Rural adolescent girl students were more altruistic than rural adolescent boy students.
- Rural altruistic adolescent boy students achieved significantly higher result than rural altruistic adolescent girl students on Extraversion and Agreeableness of personality scale.
- Significant impact of Altruism of rural adolescent students existed on Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Agreeableness.
- Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Agreeableness- the three of Big Five

Personality Traits of rural adolescent students can be predicted from their scores in Altruism.

Adolescence is the vital period in which personality reaches its maturity. In this stage parents and teachers play the pivotal role in shaping the personality of adolescent students. Conscientiousness, Agreeableness and Extraversion, as revealed by the present research, are three Big Personality traits of making one altruistic. Hence, to develop altruistic behaviors among rural adolescents those three traits should be developed through moral education and making the students involved in social interactions. In spite of both personality and altruism being partly inherited, they both can be flourished through desired ways if family and school carry out their responsibilities properly. To achieve this goal, sufficient schools should be set up in rural areas and rural illiterate families should be showered with effective literacy/education and also financial support should be provided to them. School being the miniature of society; it must take initiatives to increase social interaction as well as to cater social culture among the adolescent students. Consequently, rural society will gain more altruistic adolescents for its progress.

### REFERENCES

1. Aranson, E., et. al. (2004). Social Psychology (2nd Ed.). Toronto, ON: Prentice Hall.
2. Batson, C. D., & Oleson, K. C. Current Status of the Empathy-Altruism Hypothesis. Review of Personality and Social Psychology, 12, 62-85, 1991
3. Bierhoff, W.H., and E. Rohmann (2004). Altruistic Personality in the Context of Empathy-Altruism Hypothesis. European Journal of Personality, 18, 351-65.
4. Drebera, A., Emma, V. Essenb, and Eva, Ranhillc. "In Bloom: Gender Differences in Preferences Among Adolescents". Social Science Research Network, 35(734), 88-97, Jul. 2012, [Online]. Available: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1804278>.
5. Emmerik, I.H., I.M. Jawahar, and T.H.Stone (2004). The Relationship between Personality and Discretionary Helping Behaviors. Psychological Report, 95(1), 355-65.
6. James, S.B., et. al. Empathy, communication, and prosocial behavior. Communication Monographs, 55(2), 198-213, Jun. 2009, (online). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03637758809376166>
7. Mandal, M.B., and C. Mehera. (2016). A Study on Altruism and Interest in Literature at Higher Secondary Level. American Journal of Educational Research, 4 (9) 689-694, Newark.
8. Michael, V.S., and M.R.Roelofs (Nov. 2011) Heterogeneous Preferences for Altruism: Gender and Personality, Social Status, Giving and Taking. Experimental Economics. 14(4), 490-506. [Online, Mar 2011] DOI: 10.1007/s10683-011-9278-4
9. Rashmi, S., DK Sharma and CS Sushil. (2010). A Comparative Study of Altruism among the Boys and Girls of Joint and Nuclear Families. Journal of Mental Health and Human Behavior, 15 (2), 88-90.
10. Smith, E.R., & Mackie, D.M. (2000). Social Psychology (2nd Ed.). New York: Psychology Press.
11. Toussaint, L. and Jhon. R. Webb. "Gender Differences in the Relationship between Empathy and Forgiveness". J. Soc Psychol, 145 (6), 673-685, 2005.
12. Tait, D. J., & C.M Whiteman (2009). Personality Traits of Altruistic People: Empathy and Big Five Factors. Dissertation. Online: <http://hdl.handle.net/1842/3547>.